

I. Consent Calendar

Action: BOARS approved the October 7, 2011 Minutes.

II. Chair's Announcements

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

Vice Chair Johnson represented BOARS at the October Academic Council meeting. He made a presentation on the new admissions policy that covered the history of the effort, expected outcomes, BOARS' motivation behind the changes, and its plans for monitoring its effects on the applicant, admit, and yield pools. Council discussed UC's ability to accommodate the 9x9 guarantee and a recent *Los Angeles Times* [article](#) that cited confusion about the extent to which the SAT Subject Tests, while officially optional under the new admissions policy, are still a *de facto* requirement for admission to selective campuses and majors.

President Yudof has sent a letter to the chancellors stating his expectation that application fee revenue represent a floor for the funding necessary to successfully implement the new admissions policy. The President will join BOARS in December to discuss this and other topics. Vice Provost for Educational Partnerships Russ Rumberger will also join BOARS to discuss what he has learned about the evaluation of online education in high schools.

Chair Jacob met with the UC Irvine Admissions Committee to discuss the BOARS [transfer admissions proposal](#). He heard concerns about the extent to which politics is driving the policy and how the proposal to evaluate all transfer applicants on the basis of major preparation would affect certain populations. Some Irvine departments are concerned that it may be unreasonable to ask the community colleges to prepare students for some majors (e.g., Classics). Chair Jacob noted that transfer admission is becoming more competitive, so UC needs to be clear about the requirements, because major preparation will become increasingly more important even without the new policy.

UCSC has been discussing ways to ensure that transfer students arrive there prepared to enter their intended major. The campus is engaged in a "major mapping" effort that is looking at which courses are required for various majors and when, to help streamline redundancies and align major prerequisites with what is available at the CCC. The campus is also discussing improvements to ASSIST that would allow potential transfers to see the major requirements they have and have not completed.

Chair Jacob attended a meeting hosted by the CA Department of Education regarding the State's adoption of the Common Core standards and its decision to replace the California Standards Test with the Smarter Balanced test by 2014-15. The CDE wants UC to sign an MOU agreeing to participate in the development of the new test, and to honor it for course placement, although UC is unlikely to adopt a placement test before it is established. He also shared with the CDE BOARS' revisions of area 'b' and 'c' that incorporate Common Core language.

Chair Jacob and several UC admissions directors presented a session on the new admissions policy at the annual meeting of the College Board in New York on October 26. It

provided an overview of comprehensive review at UC and some of the recent changes in policy. A separate session on the “ideal student” hosted by several highly selective colleges included a discussion about the pressures facing high school students to overachieve, students who push aside their passions merely to be more competitive for college admission, the reintroduction of segregation into secondary education, and the culpability of higher education in those problems.

John Whitely has suggested that BOARS be more engaged in developing public messages about admissions-related issues. Chair Jacob said he will constitute a Messaging Subcommittee to focus on UC’s communications about the role of the Subject Tests and ELC status in admissions, nonresident and transfer admissions, a-g, and other issues.

Discussion: Vice President Sakaki recommended that the Messaging Subcommittee add a consultant from UCOP Communications and consider how UC communicates to its various constituent groups—students, parents, counselors, legislators, and the general public.

A BOARS member noted that 36% of UCSB transfer students entering a math major are on academic probation after their first year.

IV. Consultation with the UCOP Office of Admissions

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director for Transfer Policy*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Admissions Director for Articulation and Eligibility*

Judy Sakaki: UCOP continues its search to fill vacant leadership positions in Undergraduate Admissions. The old Executive Director position has been split into two positions—a policy-focused Associate Vice President and a Director responsible for interacting with campuses and the community. BOARS members are encouraged to forward names of potential candidates to Vice President Sakaki.

Kate Jeffery: Monica Lin, the new Associate Director for Undergraduate Admissions, joined the Office of Admissions on October 26. She will be responsible for high school and transfer articulation, ‘a-g’ review issues, and the UC Curriculum Integration Institutes. (The next UCCI Institute is scheduled for November 6-9, and is focused on green curricula.)

Director Jeffery distributed systemwide data on freshman and transfer applications, admits, SIRs, and enrollments by residency status, gender, and ethnicity for the five-year period between fall 2007 and fall 2011. The data can help inform BOARS’ discussions on a wide range of issues. The data and/or its presentation can be modified as needed, and can be produced for each campus.

She noted that the admissions rate used in the data is calculated as admits/applications and the yield rate is calculated as admits/enrollments. Overall applications to UC have increased steadily at both the freshman and transfer levels and for both residents and nonresidents, over the five-year period. The sharp decline in the systemwide freshman admit rate last year was largely due to Merced’s new referral pool “opt-in” policy. To save on workload, Merced contacted referral students in advance and asked them to indicate if they were interested in attending Merced, and offered admission only to those students who indicated an interest. The effect was to lower the number of admitted students by about 7000. There was a similar effect on the transfer admission rate.

The admit rate for both domestic and international nonresidents increased last year, and increased at a higher rate than residents, although the nonresident yield rate is still much lower than the rate for residents. The vast majority of nonresident transfer applicants, admits, and enrollees are international students.

UCOP has asked campuses to provide preliminary enrollment targets for 2012-13 as well as a general strategy going forward to 2015. The President's Enrollment Management Council will begin meeting at the end of November to discuss targets. In general, UCOP wants to give campuses the flexibility to make decisions.

Discussion: It was noted that the yield data show that access to UC is increasing for Californians, despite the financial crisis. It may be more meaningful to compare the yield rate to the applicant pool rather than the admit pool, however, due to the Merced policy change. In addition, the admit rate for nonresidents is high, but the yield rate is much smaller compared to residents. One member said BOARS should review data on the academic performance and persistence of nonresidents compared to residents.

It was noted that there has been a steady increase in the number of underrepresented minority applications and admits to the UC system over the past five years (until last year's drop for all groups due to the Merced effect). Some URM groups, particularly African-Americans and American Indians, continue to have low admit rates, although the number of African-American SIRs increased in 2011. BOARS should continue to monitor disparate impact as UC enters the new era of admissions. It was noted that the number of African-American and American Indian applicants and SIRs will decrease as tuition increases.

One member expressed concern about the sharp drop in American Indian applications in 2011, despite the fact that an applicant's membership in a federally recognized tribe can now be [considered](#) as part of Selection Criterion #13. Shawn Brick noted that the drop may be due to a change in the way UC is asking the question on the application. Effective in 2011, students who select "Native American/Alaskan" as their ethnicity are being asked to choose between "federally recognized," "state recognized," or "other/unknown." The drop could be due to the fact that students who answer "federally recognized" must check a box indicating that they understand UC may attempt to verify this affiliation. BOARS felt it should try to determine if this policy change had resulted in the decline in American Indian applications, and if so, decide whether the advantages envisioned by the policy authors outweigh the loss in applications.

One member noted that it is difficult to understand what some of the ethnicity-based transfer data mean without additional campus-level data about which of the admitted transfers were admitted through TAG.

Chair Jacob noted that BOARS is not usually involved in enrollment management discussions, but those discussions are particularly important this year due to concerns about nonresident admission. The Enrollment Management Council should be reminded about BOARS' "compare favorably" policy as it discusses resident and nonresident targets.

It was noted that all campuses are putting more resources into recruitment to increase nonresident enrollment. However, campuses differ in their ability to generate nonresident tuition revenue. It may be time to revisit past recommendations for socializing NRT across campuses.

One member asked if UCOP was considering a two-tier policy that would allow residents who were not accepted to UC, but willing to pay the nonresident tuition rate, to be considered in a separate pool with nonresidents. Vice President Sakaki noted that such a plan was not under current consideration and would seem to run contrary to UC's values.

IV (a). Transfer Subcommittee

- *With Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director for Transfer Policy*

Chair Jacob asked the Transfer Subcommittee to review policy provisions for denying “Mixed record” transfers (those with both CCC units and units from other four-year universities) with a large number of units. His concern was prompted by the case of a City College student who was encouraged to study abroad and earned upper division credits abroad, but was subsequently not able to transfer to UC.

Associate Director Brick noted that UC caps transferable Community College credits at 70 units, but will accept transfers who have taken far more than 70 units if those units are taken at the CCC only. UC campuses generally bar students with between 80 and 90 units from transfer, whether they are upper or lower division units, when the total number of units includes coursework from a four-year institution. The rationale is that campuses want a certain number of units taken at UC to confer a UC degree, and do not want to admit “senior-level” students. In addition, the legislature wants to limit “excess” units. Counselors say they are seeing more of these students, and need more direction about how to advise them. UCOP is in the process of surveying campuses to get a more complete sense about how each treats the issue.

He added that UCOP has identified elements of Senate Regulations covering transfer admission that may be outdated, including SR 476.B regarding an eligible freshman who returns to UC after attending a community college.

Discussion: It was noted that BOARS should clarify the rationale for the rule, along with how many students are affected, before making any recommendations.

One member remarked that it makes sense for UC to require transfers to complete a certain number of units at UC in the major. Policy should not allow transfers to take only a semester or two here and graduate; however, credits from another university should not automatically preclude a student from transferring. It would be logical for policy to treat lower division units from a four-year institution and a community college the same in the calculation of the 70 unit cap total. The campus/major should then decide which units count, and for what.

It was noted that BOARS might address an education abroad experience specifically, and that any rejected student can petition for an exception. Another member remarked that every applicant, including transfers with excess units, should receive an individualized review. UC needs a sensible policy that accommodates individual circumstances and life-long learners.

It was noted that students in some fields may receive higher quality lower division preparation at a CSU. Shawn Brick noted that a transfer student would still have to meet the rules for community college transfer to receive preferential treatment in admissions.

Action: Shawn Brick will return with information about how campuses are implementing the transfer unit cap policy, and how each would address the case of a student who is attempting to transfer with a single semester of four-year college credit on top of the CCC unit cap.

IV (b). Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

- *With Monica Lin, Associate Admissions Director for Articulation and Eligibility*

The Subcommittee reviewed a [national primer on K-12 education](#) from the International Association for K-12 Online Learning regarding the challenges and opportunities that exist in the

online world. Members also heard from the BOARS undergraduate student representative about her experiences with online education at the secondary level.

Action: Monica Lin will provide the A&E Subcommittee with 2-4 online provider applications for review prior to the next BOARS meeting.

V. Metrics for Assessing the New Freshman Admission Policy

UCOP has prepared an agenda of research questions to assess the effect of the new admissions policy, including how well it expands the applicant pool and outcomes for the 9x9 cohorts, both overall and in the referral pool.

BOARS suggested a few additions to the research agenda:

- Characteristics of student cohorts who take and who do not take the SAT Subject Tests and their likelihood of admission
- Applicants and admitted students from the new 9% ELC pool who would not have met eligibility requirements or been admitted in the past
- Application rates and demographics of students who applied for 2012 who would have been eligible or guaranteed under the old policy, but who are not guaranteed now

VI. Establishing an ELC Referral Pool

Chair Jacob circulated a proposed plan for full admission of the ELC 9% that seeks to minimize their representation in the referral pool and does not relegate all to UC Merced. First, campuses will be encouraged to take ELC status more seriously in comprehensive review and to consider admitting all ELC students up to a certain percentage or implementing a UCSB-style school context model. Next, ELC's not admitted to their preferred campus would enter a systemwide referral pool by mid-March, which all campuses could access. Students would receive a letter or email from interested campuses asking them if they want to be considered.

Director Jeffery said the mid-March timing is nearly impossible logistically. She is also sensitive to the fact that no campus wants to be forced to admit an ELC student who may be less qualified or to review files of students they are not going to admit. In addition, campuses may balk at giving disproportional weight to ELC status over other comprehensive review criteria.

She suggested an alternative that would build on the current referral process. ELC students denied admission to their preferred campuses would be added to the regular referral pool and guaranteed admission to Merced; in addition, they would receive a letter indicating that they have an opportunity to have their application reviewed at other UC campuses in addition to the guarantee at Merced. The timing would parallel the nonresident referral pool to accommodate campus and UCOP workload concerns.

Discussion: There was support for both proposals. It was noted that ideally, each campus would commit to take a portion of the ELC 9%, although it may be better to encourage, rather than mandate, any actions regarding ELC, at least for the first year. The concern is that the ELC cutoff for some campuses will be quite modest. It was also noted that ELC is a Regents mandate,

not a request – “UC campuses must remain committed to recruiting students from the full range of CA high schools.” It was noted that students do not always make the most strategic or informed application choices, and would welcome the chance to attend a UC campus they hadn’t initially considered, so the ELC group will include students a campus would have admitted had the student applied. It was noted that holistic score sharing should be done at the point of the opt-in, and that giving students the opportunity to list a 2nd, 3rd, 4th choice campus on the application could help campuses determine potential interest in advance.

Action: BOARS will discuss the issue again in December.

VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Chair

- o *Robert Anderson*

The Governor’s [Twelve Point Pension Reform Plan](#) incorporates several reforms UC has already implemented to the UC Retirement System, but it also has a number of questionable provisions that could do serious harm to faculty recruitment and retention, including a proposal to blend Social Security with a Defined Benefit plan. The UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement has issued [comments](#) in response to the plan, and the administration has conveyed to the Governor that there are several areas in which the plan would not serve UC’s best interest.

VIII. Review Items

Allowing LGBT Applicants to Self-identify on the Application:

On October 8, the Governor signed [Assembly Bill 620](#) requesting that UC provide the opportunity for students, staff, and faculty to report their sexual orientation on any forms used to collect demographic data. The CCC Academic Senate recently adopted a resolution in support of allowing students to self-identify voluntarily on college and district forms.

Some BOARS members noted that would be valuable to collect the information, but many were not convinced that the application for admission would be the appropriate venue for collecting it. The main concern is the privacy of applicants who in most cases will need their parents’ approval before submitting their application, the security of University databases, and the potential for discrimination. Others were more supportive, noting that students should have the right to self-identify.

It was noted that the UCUES survey collects LGBT data on enrolled students, although UCUES data are not added to the students’ file; there is also a systemwide climate survey in development. The SIR might be another option.

IX. Executive Session

BOARS met in executive session.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Bill Jacob